



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,236	01/29/2001	Daniel Isaac Goodman	21939-05720	9845

7590 06/22/2005

Marc Sockol  
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.  
600 Hansen Way  
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043

EXAMINER

KHOSHNOODI, NADIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2133

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/774,236	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GOODMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Nadia Khoshnoodi	<b>Art Unit</b> 2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/7/2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-175 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-18, 22-37, 39-43, 47-58, 60-63, 67-79, 81-84, 88-92, 115-132, 141-175 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

*pp*

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 13,19-21,38,44-46,59,64-66,80,85-87,93-114 and 133-140.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

Claims 13, 19-21, 38, 44-46, 59, 64-66, 80, 85-87, 93-114, and 133-140 have been cancelled. Applicant's arguments/amendments with respect to previously presented claims 141-142 and newly presented claim 174 filed February 7, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Furthermore, Applicant's arguments/amendments with respect to amended claims 1, 9-12, 14-18, 22-23, 26, 34-37, 39, 41-43, 47-48, 51, 60-63, 67-68, 70-72, 81-84, 88-89, 92, 115, 118, 124, & 126, previously presented claims 2-8, 24-25, 27-33, 40, 49-50, 52-58, 69, 73-79, 90-91, 116-117, 119-123, 125, & 127-132, and newly presented claims 143-173 & 175 filed February 7, 2005 have been fully considered and therefore the claims are rejected under new grounds. The Examiner would like to point out that this action is made final (See MPEP 706.07a).

### ***Specification***

The corrections to the specification filed on 2/7/2005, thus the specification is no longer objected to.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Previous 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections in regards to claims 20, 45, 65, 71, 86, 92, 118-120, and 126 have been withdrawn.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant contends that neither Howard et al. or Bloomberg teach "controlling a display layout for the modified page, comprising determining a layout based on spatial characteristics of

Art Unit: 2133

the decrypted text instead of spatial characteristics of the encrypted text, to ensure that the display layout corresponds to a page containing the designated portion of original text.”

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bloomberg teaches that the encoded data blocks are based off of text that is not encrypted, hence the original text. These blocks which contain encoded data therefore determine a layout based on spatial characteristics of the decrypted text, hence the original text, instead of on the spatial characteristics of the encrypted text in order to ensure that the display layout corresponds to the original page with text.

Applicant further contends that Bloomberg does not replace text with text; rather, Bloomberg replaces text with rectangular blocks. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bloomberg teaches replacing text with encoded data (col. 10, lines 42-48). Furthermore, originally a text string is taken, as seen in fig. 2, any of the elements 12, 14, 17, or 18, where text strings are ultimately broken down and represented by bits. Therefore, when Bloomberg teaches replacing text with encoded data, also data broken down into bits, it suffices as “replacing first text strings with second text strings when formatting a page to determine a page layout,” as recited in the claims. Thus the rejections pertaining to claims 141-142 and 174 are maintained.

Due to the reasons stated above, the Examiner maintains rejections with respect to previously presented claims 141-142 and newly presented claim 174. Bloomberg teach the limitations that the Applicant suggests distinguish from the prior art. In regards to independent claims 1, 26, 51, 72, 115, 124, and 172-173, as well as their corresponding dependent claims Howard et al. and Bloomberg teach the limitations that the Applicant suggests distinguish from the prior art. Furthermore, Howard et al. and Bloomberg in combination teach the limitations not explicitly disclosed by either of the two references taken singly. However, since the grounds of

Art Unit: 2133

rejection has changed based on the Applicant's amendments, the new grounds of rejection appears below (regarding those specific claims). Therefore, it is the Examiner's conclusion that amended independent claims 1, 26, 51, 72, 115, & 124 and newly presented claims 143-173, & 175 are not patentably distinct or non-obvious over the prior art of record as presented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

I. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

II. Claims 141-142 and 174 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being fully anticipated by Bloomberg United States Patent No. 5,761,686.

As per claims 141-142 and 174:

Bloomberg teaches a method for protecting text within a page displayed by a computer comprising replacing first text strings with second text strings when formatting a page to determine a page layout (col. 12, lines 5-18) and replacing a first portion of text with a second portion of text when rendering the page according to the page layout into a graphics device (col. 10, lines 42-62).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

III. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

IV. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-18, 22-28, 30-37, 39-43, 47-53, 55-58, 60-63, 67-74, 76-79, 81-84, 88-92, 143-172, and 175 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045 and further in view of Bloomberg United States Patent No. 5,761,686.

As per claims 1, 26, and 171:

Howard et al. substantially teach a method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer, comprising identifying a designated portion of original content contained within a page to be protected (paragraph 44, lines 3-5), modifying the page comprising encrypting the designated portion of original content to form a portion of encrypted content (paragraph 46, lines 6-10), replacing the

Art Unit: 2133

designated portion of original content within the page with the portion of encrypted content is (inherent, however this concept is suggested by paragraph 61, lines 8-11), rendering<sup>1</sup> the page into a graphics device comprising decrypting the portion of encrypted content (paragraph 51, lines 1-4), displaying at least a portion of data from the graphics device (paragraph 50, lines 1-6 corresponding to applicants' definition of items specified to be a graphics device on page 12, paragraph 49, lines 5-6) and converting content into a graphics output (paragraph 51, lines 1-4 and paragraph 68). Also disclosed by Howard et al. is wherein the content is text (paragraph 21).

Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code wherein rendering the page into a graphics device comprises controlling a display layout for the modified page comprising determining a layout based on spatial characteristics of decrypted text instead of spatial characteristics of the encrypted text, to ensure that the display layout corresponds to a page containing the designated portion of original text.

However, Bloomberg teaches that the original text is encoded to form blocks of encoded data which replace the original text until rendered for viewing purposes. Furthermore, the decrypted text is the same information as the original text, therefore Bloomberg also teaches that the layout is determined based on the spatial characteristics of the decrypted, i.e. original text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Howard et al. to allow for the layout to be determined based on spatial characteristics of the decrypted text, i.e. the original text, in order to maintain the

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the word "render" was not specifically used, the definition according to [www.netlingo.com](http://www.netlingo.com) shows that the function of rendering does take place. Below is the definition of render used.



Art Unit: 2133

properties and layout of the original page. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 7, line 48 – col. 8, line 63 and col. 9, lines 36-47 as well as depicted in figures 4 and 5.

As per claims 2, 27, 52, and 73:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the page is a web page (paragraph 38, lines 12-19).

As per claims 3, 28, 53, and 74:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 2, 27, 52, and 73. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the web page is an HTML page (paragraph 37, lines 1-25 and paragraph 39, lines 1-3).

As per claims 5, 30, 55, and 76:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the page is part of a document produced by a software application (paragraph 34).

As per claims 6, 31, 56, and 77:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics device is a memory device (paragraph 50, lines 1-6).

As per claims 7, 32, 57, and 78:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics device is a screen device (paragraph 40, lines 23-25 and paragraph 88, lines 5-11).

As per claims 8, 33, 58, and 79:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics device is a graphics port<sup>2</sup> (paragraph 39 and paragraph 40, lines 23-34). Although there is no explicit reference made to a graphics port, the elements referred to in the detailed description use ports to transfer graphics, thus it is identical to there being a graphics port.

As per claim 9 and 34:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of characters. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of characters. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to carry out the encryption based on an encoding of characters. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the

---

<sup>2</sup> The definition of port as pasted from [www.netlingo.com](http://www.netlingo.com) is as follows:

**Port** - Commonly known as the place where information goes into and out of a computer, or both. For example, the serial port on a personal computer is where a modem or printer is connected.

On the Internet, "port" often refers to a number that is shown in a URL, following a colon right after the domain name. Every service on an Internet server "listens" on a particular port number. Most of these services have standard port numbers. Web servers normally listen on port 80, and the standard Gopher port is 70. (Services can also listen on nonstandard ports, in which case the port number must be specified in a URL when the server is accessed.)

Art Unit: 2133

time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 8, lines 4-8.

As per claim 10 and 35:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of words. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of words. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to carry out the encryption based on an encoding of words. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 12, lines 22-29.

As per claim 11 and 36:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein said encrypting comprises adding leading and trailing characters to flag encrypted text. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said encrypting comprises adding leading and trailing characters to flag encrypted text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to carry out the encryption and adding leading and trailing characters to flag encrypted text. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at

Art Unit: 2133

the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 13, lines 22-26.

As per claims 12 and 37:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method wherein the content and said encrypting comprises padding encrypted text so that identical words have distinct encrypted representations (paragraph 46, lines 6-10). Although the term padding is not used, the definition of padding<sup>3</sup> suggests that it is inherent.

As per claims 14, 39, 60, and 81:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics output is a raster output (paragraph 40, lines 23-34). Although the term "raster output" is not explicitly used, a CRT<sup>4</sup> is used as the display device, hence it is identical to that of a "raster output."

---

<sup>3</sup> According to the Hacking Lexicon dictionary online, the definition of padding is as follows:

**Padding** - Padding is the process of adding unused data to the end of a message in order to make it conform to a certain length. For example, block-ciphers often work on blocks that are 64-bits (8-bytes) long. Therefore, if you have a message that is 77-bytes long, you will need to "pad" it with an extra 3-bytes to make it an even 80-bytes in size (10-blocks).

**Key point:** Padding is a regular feature of all crypto algorithms, including hashing and encryption. Some algorithms have been broken due to poor choices for padding. Most importantly, however, the size of the message can often reveal details about its contents. For example, let's assume a protocol whereby somebody accepts something with a simple message of "yes", but when it declines, it says "no" along with a reason why it was rejected. Therefore, even though the messages are encrypted, the "yes" will be a short message but the "no" will be a long message.

<sup>4</sup> The definition of Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) from the Free Online Dictionary of Computing is as pasted below:

**CRT** - An electrical device for displaying images by exciting phosphor dots with a scanned electron beam. CRTs are found in computer VDUs and monitors, televisions and oscilloscopes. The first commercially practical CRT was perfected on 29 January 1901 by Allen B DuMont.

A large glass envelope containing a negative electrode (the cathode) emits electrons (formerly called "cathode rays") when heated, as in a vacuum tube. The electrons are accelerated across a large voltage gradient toward the flat surface of the tube (the screen) which is covered with phosphor. When an electron

Art Unit: 2133

As per claims 15 and 40:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1 and 26. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein said identifying, said encrypting, and said replacing are performed by a server computer, and wherein said controlling, said rendering, and said displaying are performed by a client computer connected to the server computer over a network (paragraph 88, lines 5-11).

As per claims 16, 41, 61, and 82:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system occurring within a patched operating system function for outputting content. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of securing the cached content on the client's computer, as well as using the operating system in order to hide contents in some form. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that decrypting the portion of encrypted content occurs within a patched operating system function for outputting content. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraphs 89 and 93.

As per claims 17, 42, 62, and 83:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 16, 41, 61, and 82 above. Also disclosed by Howard et al. is the method wherein the content is

---

strikes the phosphor, light is emitted. The electron beam is deflected by electromagnetic coils around the outside of the tube so that it scans across the screen, usually in horizontal stripes. This scan pattern is known as a raster. By controlling the current in the beam, the brightness at any particular point (roughly a "pixel") can be varied.

text content (paragraph 33, lines 1-5). Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows TextOut function. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using different versions of Microsoft operating systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows TextOut function to correspond to the operating systems mentioned. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 33.

As per claims 18, 43, 63, and 84:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 16, 41, 61, and 82 above. Also disclosed by Howard et al. is the method wherein the content is text content (paragraph 33, lines 1-5). Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the operating system function is a Macintosh DrawText function. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using different versions of Macintosh operating systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that the operating system function is a Macintosh DrawText function to correspond to the operating systems mentioned. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 33.

As per claim 22, 47, 67, and 88:

Art Unit: 2133

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system, wherein said determining comprises calculating widths of character strings. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said formatting comprises calculating widths of character strings.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to incorporate formatting comprising of calculating widths of character strings. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 12, lines 22-29 and col. 14, lines 19-23.

As per claim 23, 48, 68, and 89:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 22, 47, 67, and 88. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system, wherein said determining comprises decrypting encrypted text strings. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said formatting comprises decrypting encrypted text strings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to incorporate formatting comprising decrypting encrypted text strings. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg as depicted in figures 4 and 5.

As per claims 24, 49, 69, and 90:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 23, 48, 68, and 89. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system of decrypting encrypted text strings on the client's computer (paragraph 46, lines 6-10). Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. or Bloomberg is the method/system occurring within a patched operating system function for determining widths of character strings. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of securing the cached content on the client's computer, as well as using the operating system in order to hide contents in some form. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that decrypting encrypted text strings occur within a patched operating system function for determining widths of character strings. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraphs 89 and 93.

As per claims 25, 50, 70, and 91:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 24, 49, 69, and 90. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. or Bloomberg is the method/system wherein the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows GetTextExtent function. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using different versions of Microsoft operating systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows GetTextExtent function to correspond to the operating systems mentioned. This modification would have been obvious because a person having



ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 33.

As per claims 51, 72, and 172:

Howard et al. teach a method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer, comprising accessing a page containing a portion of encrypted content (paragraph 39, lines 1-3), rendering<sup>5</sup> the page into a graphics device comprising decrypting the portion of encrypted content (paragraph 51, lines 1-4), and displaying at least a portion of data from the graphics device (paragraph 50, lines 1-6 corresponding to applicants' definition of items specified to be a graphics device on page 12, paragraph 49, lines 5-6) and converting content into a graphics output (paragraph 51, lines 1-4 and paragraph 68). Also disclosed by Howard et al. is wherein the content is text (paragraph 21).

Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code wherein rendering the page into a graphics device comprises controlling a display layout for the modified page comprising determining a layout based on spatial characteristics of decrypted text instead of spatial characteristics of the encrypted text, to ensure that the display layout corresponds to a page containing the designated portion of original text.

However, Bloomberg teaches that the original text is encoded to form blocks of encoded data which replace the original text until rendered for viewing purposes. Furthermore, the decrypted text is the same information as the original text, therefore Bloomberg also teaches that the layout is determined based on the spatial characteristics of the decrypted, i.e. original text.

---

<sup>5</sup> See footnote (1) on page 4

Art Unit: 2133

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Howard et al. to allow for the layout to be determined based on spatial characteristics of the decrypted text, i.e. the original text, in order to maintain the properties and layout of the original page. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 7, line 48 – col. 8, line 63 and col. 9, lines 36-47 as well as depicted in figures 4 and 5.

As per claim 71:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 51. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method further comprising receiving the page having a portion of encrypted content from a server computer (paragraph 88, lines 5-11).

As per claim 92:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 72. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach a system further comprising a network connector and a receiver receiving the page having a portion of encrypted content from a server computer via said network connector (paragraph 39).

As per claims 143, 157, and 175:

Howard et al. substantially teaches a method/system/ computer readable medium with stored program code for displaying a page containing text while protecting the text from being copied, comprising rendering a source file for a page containing text into graphics output, wherein (i) when displayed on a screen, the page containing text appears with a first portion of text (par. 33) and (ii) an electronic capture of the screen data produces an image containing a

second portion instead of the first portion of text, the second portion being different than the first portion of text (par. 63-66 and par. 96-97, where the second portion is a blank and flushed out portion of text).

Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system/ computer readable medium with stored program code wherein (iii) the source file from which the page is rendered contains a third portion of text in place of the first portion of text, the third portion being different than the first portion of text. However, Bloomberg teaches that lines of text can be replaced, when the page is rendered into an iconic image, where the first portion of text is replaced by another portion of text that is different in appearance to the first portion of text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code disclosed in Howard et al. to have the source file from which the page is rendered to contain a third portion of text being different than the first portion of text. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 4, lines 16-53.

As per claims 144 and 158:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the source file is a text document file (par. 10-11 and par. 34-37).

As per claims 145 and 159:

Art Unit: 2133

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the source file is an HTML file (par. 10-11).

As per claims 146 and 160:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the second portion of text is an encryption of the first portion of text. However, Bloomberg teaches that the third portion of text can be an encryption of a first portion of text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to have the second portion also be an encryption of the first portion of text. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 4, lines 16-53.

As per claims 147 and 161:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Bloomberg teaches that the third portion of text can be an encryption of a first portion of text (col. 4, lines 16-53).

As per claims 148 and 162:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. or Bloomberg is the method/system wherein the second portion of text is identical to the third portion of text. However, Bloomberg teaches that the third portion of text can be an encryption of the first portion of text thereby

Art Unit: 2133

making it obvious that the second portion of text can be an encryption of the first portion of text as well (col. 4, lines 16-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to use the same encryption algorithm when encrypting the first portion of text. It then follows that the second and third portions of text would be identical because they were both encrypted using the same algorithm in combination with the first portion of text.

As per claims 149 and 163:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. or Bloomberg is the method/system wherein the second portion of text is different than the third portion of text. However, Bloomberg teaches that the third portion of text can be an encryption of the first portion of text thereby making it obvious that the second portion of text can be an encryption of the first portion of text as well (col. 4, lines 16-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to use two different encryption algorithms when encrypting the first portion of text. It then follows that the second and third portions of text would be different because they were both encrypted using different encryption algorithms with the first portion of text.

As per claims 150 and 164:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the electronic capture of the screen data is performed by a PrintScreen command (par. 8-9).

As per claims 151 and 165:

Art Unit: 2133

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the electronic capture of the screen data is performed by a Copy command and a Paste command (par. 4-5). As per claims 152 and 166:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the electronic capture of the screen data is written to a computer memory (par. 14-15). As per claims 153 and 167:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the electronic capture of the screen data is written to a clipboard (par. 4-5 and par. 33). As per claims 154 and 168:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the rendering is performed by a web browser application (par. 88). As per claims 155 and 169:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the rendering can be performed by a document reader application (par. 92). As per claims 156 and 170:

Art Unit: 2133

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 143 and 157. Furthermore, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the rendering can be performed by a document editor application (par. 94).

V. Claims 4, 29, 54, and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045 as applied to claims 2, 27, 52, 73, 94, and 105 above, and further in view of the definition of XML, found at netlingo.com.

As per claims 4, 29, 54, and 75:

Howard et al. and Bloomberg substantially teach the method/system as applied to claims 2, 27, 52, and 73. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the web page is an XML page. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the web page is an HTML page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Howard et al. to incorporate the web page as an XML page. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by the definition of XML as found on [www.netlingo.com](http://www.netlingo.com) and pasted below:

A programming language/specification developed by the W3C. XML is a pared-down version of SGML, designed especially for Web documents. It enables Web authors and Web developers to create their own customized tags to provide functionality not available with HTML. For example, XML supports links that point to multiple documents (as opposed to HTML links, which can reference just one destination each). XML provides a powerful set of tools for developing a new generation of Web applications, including tools like database exchange, distribution of processing to clients, multiple views of data, intelligent agents, management of document collections, and so on.

VI. Claims 115-117, 121, 124-126, and 130 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloomberg United States Patent No. 5,761,686.

Art Unit: 2133

As per claims 115, 124, and 173:

Bloomberg substantially teaches a method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code for protecting text within a page displayed by a computer comprising formatting a page containing a first portion of text to determine a page layout (col. 14, lines 10-31) and rendering the page according to the page layout into a graphics device comprising replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text (col. 10, lines 42-48), converting second portion of text to a graphics output (col. 10, line 58 – col. 11, line 12), and writing the graphics output into the graphics device (col. 11, lines 4-12).

Not explicitly disclosed by Bloomberg is the method/system/computer readable medium with stored program code determining a layout based on spatial characteristics of a second portion of text instead of spatial characteristics of a first portion of text, to ensure that the display layout corresponds to a page containing the designated portion of the second portion of text.

However, Bloomberg teaches that the original text is encoded to form blocks of encoded data which replace the original text until rendered for viewing purposes. Furthermore, the decrypted text is the same information as the original text, therefore Bloomberg also teaches that the layout is determined based on the spatial characteristics of the decrypted, i.e. original text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Howard et al. to allow for the layout to be determined based on spatial characteristics of the second portion of text, i.e. the decrypted text, i.e. the original text, in order to maintain the properties and layout of the original page as opposed to determining the layout based on the first portion of text, i.e. the encrypted text. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was



Art Unit: 2133

made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 7, line 48 – col. 8, line 63 and col. 9, lines 36-47 as well as depicted in figures 4 and 5.

As per claims 116 and 125:

Bloomberg substantially teaches the method/system as applied to claims 115 and 124. Furthermore, Bloomberg teaches wherein the first portion of text has the same word width as does the second portion of text (fig. 2, element 12 and fig. 4, element 52).

As per claims 117 and 126:

Bloomberg substantially teaches the method/system as applied to claims 115 and 124. Furthermore, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein the graphics output is a raster output (col. 23, lines 20-24). Although the term “raster output” is not explicitly used, a CRT<sup>6</sup> is used as a display device, hence it is identical to that of a “raster output.”

As per claims 121 and 130:

Bloomberg substantially teaches the method/system as applied to claims 115 and 124. Furthermore, Bloomberg teaches the method wherein said formatting comprises replacing first text strings with the second text strings (col. 14, lines 19-23) and calculating widths of the second text portion based on selected font types and font sizes (col. 7, lines 55-62 and col. 12, lines 5-18).

VII. Claims 118-120, 122-123, 127-129, and 131-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloomberg United States Patent No. 5,761,686 as applied to claims 115 and 124 above, and further in view of Howard et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045.

---

<sup>6</sup> See footnote (5) on page 7

Art Unit: 2133

As per claims 118 and 127:

Bloomberg substantially teaches the method/system of replacing the first portion of text with the second portion of text. Not explicitly disclosed by Bloomberg is the method occurring within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output.

However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using the client's computer for outputting the text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that replacing the first portion of text with the second portion of text occur within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 88, lines 5-11.

As per claims 119 and 128:

Bloomberg and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system wherein said replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text occurs within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output, as applied to claims 118 and 127 above. Not explicitly disclosed by Bloomberg or Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows TextOut function. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using different versions of Microsoft operating systems.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows TextOut function to correspond to the operating systems mentioned. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the

Art Unit: 2133

time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 33.

As per claims 120 and 129:

Bloomberg and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system wherein said replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text occurs within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output, as applied to claims 118 and 127 above. Not explicitly disclosed by Bloomberg or Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the operating system function is a Macintosh DrawText function. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using different versions of Macintosh operating systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that the operating system function is a Macintosh DrawText function to correspond to the operating systems mentioned. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 33.

As per claims 122 and 131:

Bloomberg and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system wherein said formatting comprises replacing first text strings with second text strings and calculating widths of the second text strings based on selected font types and font sizes as applied to claims 121 and 130 above. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. or Bloomberg is the method/system occurring within a patched operating system function for determining widths of character strings. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using the client's computer to carry out

Art Unit: 2133

operations that occur before outputting. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Bloomberg so that replacing first text strings with second text strings occurs within a patched operating system function for determining widths of character strings. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 88, lines 5-11.

As per claims 123 and 132:

Bloomberg and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system wherein replacing first text strings with second text strings occurs within a patched operating system function for determining widths of characters as applied to claims 122 and 131 above. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. or Bloomberg is the method/system wherein the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows GetTextExtent function. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using different versions of Microsoft operating systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows GetTextExtent function to correspond to the operating systems mentioned. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 33.


*Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nadia Khoshnoodi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3825. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

  
Nadia Khoshnoodi  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2133  
6/16/2005

NK

  
ALBERT DECADY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100